

CONFIDENTIAL

PRESIDENTIAL COMMITTEE ON  
WORKPLACE POLICIES AND PRACTICES

Recommendation Number Five (5)

---

**Analysis of Costs and Benefits of  
Reinstating Temporary  
Employment Agency**

---



**STANFORD UNIVERSITY**  
**January 2006**  
**Final Report**

## Table of Contents

Section	Title	Page
1.0	Executive Summary.....	1
2.0	Feasibility Study Overview - Internal Temporary Agency.....	3
2.1	Stanford Temporary Service – Chronology and News Reports.....	3
2.2	Summary of Comments About Stanford Temporary Service (STS).....	7
3.0	Temporary Services at Other Universities.....	9
3.1	University of Washington (UW) – UTEMP.....	9
3.2	University of California, Irvine (UCI) – Quick Temp.....	10
3.3	San Francisco State University (SFSU) – Temporary Pool.....	10
4.0	Considerations for Creating an In-House Temporary Service.....	11
4.1	Manpower’s On-Site Program at Stanford.....	14
5.0	Numerical Data – Stanford’s Casual and Temporary Workforce.....	16
6.0	Pre-Bids for Stanford On-Site Program 2006 (external vendors).....	17
6.1	West Valley Staffing Group (WVSG) – Pre-Bid Proposal <i>excerpts</i> .....	17
6.2	Manpower Staffing Services (Manpower) – Pre-Bid Proposal <i>excerpts</i> .....	18
6.3	Kelly Services (KS) – Pre-Bid Proposal <i>excerpts</i> .....	19
6.4	Option 1 – Pre-Bid Proposal <i>excerpts</i> .....	19
6.5	Spherion – Pre-Bid Proposal <i>excerpts</i> .....	20
7.0	Model – Stanford Temporary Service 2 (STS2).....	22
7.1	Considerations – What Problem Are We Trying To Solve? .....	24
7.2	Alternatives to Stanford Temporary Service 2 (STS2) .....	26
8.0	Summary of Findings.....	27
	Acknowledgements.....	29
	Appendices.....	30

## List of Tables

Table	Title	Page
1	Casual and Temporary Workforce - Calendar Year 2005.....	16
2	Vendor Mark-Up Rates for Stanford On-Site Temporary Program.....	17
3	Components and Annual Costs – Stanford Temporary Service 2 Model .....	22
4	Annual Costs and Mark-Up Rates to Operate Temporary Service .....	23
5	Survey of Temporary and Casual Workers.....	24
6	Survey of Temporary and Casual Workers.....	25

**Abstract** - An “analysis of the costs and benefits of reinstating Stanford’s temporary employment agency” indicates that doing so would not create a “superior ability to monitor labor standards and conditions of workers.” More effective alternatives are suggested. Departmental flexibility needs regarding worker selection may outweigh all other potential benefits, including modest cost savings. Reinstatement of Stanford’s temporary agency is not recommended.

## **1.0 Executive Summary**

Key elements of this report are summarized below. Detailed information is found at the pages indicated.

### **2.0 Feasibility Study Overview - Internal Temporary Agency** *(page 3)*

Stanford’s former internal temporary agency, similar services at other universities, and “best practices” were reviewed. A cost-benefit analysis was completed to determine whether “reinstating” the former agency is feasible.

#### **2.1 Stanford Temporary Service – Chronology and News Reports** *(page 3)*

A brief history of the service that existed from 1990-1998 shows that it was financially successful and clients were satisfied.

#### **2.2 Summary of Comments About Stanford Temporary Service (STS)** *(page 7)*

Interviews with those having knowledge about STS operations suggests that the organization’s purpose was unclear. Comments indicate that competition from outside vendors made the service challenging to operate.

### **3.0 Temporary Services at Other Universities** *(page 9)*

The University of Washington, University of California at Irvine, and San Francisco State University operate temporary worker programs varying in approach and size.

### **4.0 Considerations for Creating an In-House Temporary Service** *(page 11)*

Excerpts from, “Creating New Temporary Hire Options Through In-House Agencies” by the Society for Human Resources Management (SHRM) provide key insights.

#### **4.1 Manpower's On-Site Program at Stanford** *(page 14)*

Manpower Staffing Services succeeded STS in 1998 and operated until 2003 when its annual Stanford billing was \$4.3 million. Their on-site staff included three people.

#### **5.0 Numerical Data – Stanford's Casual and Temporary Workforce** *(page 16)*

During calendar year 2005 Stanford had almost 4,700 casual and temporary workers (excluding bargaining unit, academic staff, etc.). Typical assignments lasted less than seven (7) weeks.

#### **6.0 Pre-Bids for Stanford On-Site Program 2006 (external vendors)** *(page 17)*

Vendors provided information that was used to assess the cost effectiveness of an internal agency. "Mark-up" rates for agency recruited workers placed at Stanford ranged from thirty-two (32) to thirty-five (35) percent.

#### **7.0 Model – Stanford Temporary Service 2 (STS2)** *(page 22)*

STS2, a model similar to STS was created to assess the Presidential Committee's recommendation. Exceeding STS capabilities, it provides new services (Stanford systems training) and could save the University approximately \$150k per year.

#### **7.1 Considerations – What Problem Are We Trying To Solve?** *(page 24)*

It appears that worker treatment was the impetus for the recommendation to analyze "reinstating Stanford's temporary employment agency." STS was not created to address issues related to "labor standards and conditions."

#### **7.2 Alternatives to Stanford Temporary Service 2 (STS2)** *(page 26)*

Worker treatment is best monitored at the job site within the local unit. Periodic and unscheduled visits to monitor conditions, operator sanctions, employee surveys, and an employee "hotline" to report concerns may be good alternatives to STS2.

#### **8.0 Summary of Findings** *(page 27)*

While "reinstating Stanford's temporary agency" is financially feasible and cost effective, it is not the best approach to address concerns underlying the Presidential Committee's recommendation. Suggested alternatives may prove more effective.

## **2.0 Feasibility Study Overview - Internal Temporary Agency**

Recommendation number five (5) of the Presidential Committee on Workplace Policies and Practices report dated June 11, 2004 reads as follows:

*“Stanford University should undertake an analysis of the costs and benefits of reinstating its temporary employment agency where among the benefits should be counted the superior ability to monitor labor standards and conditions of workers who are employees of Stanford University.”*

In response to the above, this report reviews the chronology and operation of the Stanford Temporary Service (referenced in the recommendation as “internal temporary agency”) through news reports and interviews. The current experience of similar operations in universities elsewhere is explored and “in-house agency” best practices information from the Society for Human Resources Management (SHRM) is presented.

Lastly, a model for reinstating the Stanford Temporary Service (STS) is presented along with an analysis of the costs and benefits as related to the recommendation.

### **2.1 “Stanford Temporary Service” – Chronology and News Reports**

Stanford Temporary Service (STS), an internal University service center designed to supply temporary workers University-wide operated from 1990-1998.

#### **CHRONOLOGY**

**1990** – Stanford University Temporary Service was started in March as a subsidized trial.

**1991** – Began operations without subsidy as an on-going service center in September with fifty- six (56) temporary hires on the University payroll.

**1998** – Approximately one hundred (100) temporary hires were on the University payroll. Stanford Temporary Service was discontinued in January and replaced by Manpower Staffing Services (Manpower) who was awarded an on-site contract.

#### **NEWS REPORTS**

During the nineties, Stanford News Service reported on Stanford Temporary Service and its successor, Manpower. These articles provide information about operational details as well as insight into what the thinking was between 1991 and 1998.

### **Laid-off workers 'temp' between regular jobs**

STANFORD -- An experimental, in-house temporary placement service will become a regular, ongoing service center effective Sept. 1, the Human Resources Services' employment department has announced.

The Stanford University Temporary Service was started as a subsidized trial in March 1990. The new, regular program is no longer subsidized and is self-sustaining.

The program can be especially valuable to employees who are laid off from their university jobs through "repositioning," such employees have said. Departments may find the service useful not only because it can save money, but also because temporaries obtained in-house are already familiar with Stanford.

While dollar estimates are not yet available, the service is expected to result in substantial savings to the university, which previously relied mostly on outside temporary employment agencies.

The service helps university departments fill temporary clerical, secretarial and administrative support-staff needs, said Rita Chalon, program administrator.

Over the past 18 months, the service has mainly operated through word of mouth, Chalon said. In that time, approximately 80 departments have used the service, with more than 400 placements being made.

There are currently 56 temporaries on the university payroll. A number of temporary placements have led to regular staff employment at Stanford, including for some recently laid-off employees.

One such person is Dorothy Antwine, who said Chalon helped her to a degree normally associated with a high-level "search" when Antwine was laid off from her job in Human Resources.

Of the temporary service, Antwine said, "I knew it was there but I didn't give it much thought."

At the urging of co-workers, Antwine, an office assistant, got in touch with Chalon after receiving four weeks layoff notice. Within two weeks, she had temporary work in the School of Engineering.

From there, Antwine moved to a temporary job at the Medical Center, then at the Development Office, where earlier this month she started a new, permanent position.

"There is life after being laid off," Antwine said. "The temporary jobs worked well for me because I could keep my 50 percent schedule and I got to move around the university and meet new people. That networking helped me get other offers."

Similarly pleased with the service was Margaret Harris, laid off from her administrative assistant position at the Medical Center in February.

Prompted by a notice given to all laid-off workers, Harris contacted Chalon "and was placed within 24 hours" at Communication Services. With steady temporary work obtained, Harris then could scan employment ads in Campus Report until she found a permanent job that was right for her. She starts her new position with the Cultures, Ideas and Values program on Sept. 1.

"There are lots of reasons why it's a good idea for Stanford," Harris said. "People who worked here before, like myself, bring a lot of the 'Stanford-specific' skills to their new jobs; we're more marketable.

"It's wonderful that Stanford is willing to do this."

Chalon said the current temporary pool includes previous Stanford employees, retirees, and employees recently laid off, as well as individuals external to the university. Skills range from entry level to advanced office experience with extensive administrative skills.

She also observed that providing the service to a broad range of people in a variety of situations can contribute to the university's goals for cultural diversity.

Full or part-time, and long or short-term assignments can be accommodated, Chalon said. If the service cannot fill a particular request with a qualified person, it then provides references to Stanford-approved outside temporary agencies.

The Temporary Service uses the same job classifications and pay structures that are used for regular staff employees. It now will be responsible for handling all paperwork related to temporary assignments. Temporary employees will bring their completed time sheets directly to the employment office, from which they will receive their paychecks -- a time-saving measure for the departments, Chalon said.

Hours of operation for the Temporary Service are 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., Monday through Friday. The office is located in the Employment Department at 855 Serra Street. More information is available from Chalon at 725-7882, or through electronic mail at [at.rlc@forsythe](mailto:at.rlc@forsythe).

## Commercial agency to replace in-house temporary service

A commercial temporary agency soon will replace Stanford's inhouse service in an effort to make the university more competitive in finding staff in one of the tightest job markets in the nation.

Linda Jack, employment manager in Human Resources, says a recent review of the way Stanford hires its temporary employees has prompted the office to search for an established company to offer the same services on campus beginning March 1. To prepare for the change, Stanford Temporary Service (STS) will not make new placements after Jan. 16.

"The decision is not about income or numbers. . . . [Stanford's service] was routinely meeting its targets," says Jack. "There are just a lot of [companies] doing this work."

That trend already is reflected in how departmental supervisors spend money looking for staff. During the 1996-97 fiscal year, STS billed \$2.1 million to departments for hiring temporary staff. In contrast, departments spent \$7.2 million on locating staff through eight approved commercial vendors, up from \$4.3 million in 1994. Supervisors also can hire employees by directly putting them on their department's payroll.

STS, a not-for-profit venture, was established seven years ago when commercial agencies offered fewer services and were often unable to meet the needs of Stanford supervisors.

"With a job market that favored employers, a small service such as ours was able to attract quality employees, charge competitive rates and deliver a level of service not matched by external firms," Jack recently wrote in a letter to supervisors.

That has changed as commercial vendors, which once provided mostly clerical workers, have become more sophisticated. Large national agencies have developed training programs, including those where temporary staff can learn software programs before starting an assignment.

"They've gotten far more aggressive about doing testing and assessment of applicants, including all kinds of personality assessments not done at Stanford," Jack says. Background checks, including researching driving and criminal records, are available. Unlike STS, agencies can afford to run regional and national advertising campaigns, a necessary tactic in a tight labor market. And they offer benefits to established temporary staff, something not available through STS.

About 100 temporary staff hired through STS are on campus at any time. Assignments can last a few days or weeks, but typically a temporary is considered someone working for less than six months or less than 50 percent time, Jack says. Temporary work is a good way to find a permanent job at Stanford and, last year, about 70 people converted to regular employment. "This is a very cost-effective way of attracting people to campus," Jack says. "I would say the majority of temporaries who come to us are looking for regular work. It's a way to get Stanford experience."

In December, requests for proposals to open an office on campus were sent to 29 firms, including the eight companies already contracting with Stanford. These are Adecco, Advanced Technical Resources, Certified Personnel, Interim Temporary Services, Kelly Services, Manpower Temporary Services, Option 1 and Project Hired/Hire Temps. Bids are due by Jan. 16 and a vendor will be selected by Feb. 17.

Jack says that supervisors will not be forced to use the company awarded the contract. However, this vendor will have subcontracting relationships with a number of other temporary firms; this will allow customers to call one instead of several agencies to find someone for a hard-to-fill slot.

Although the decision makes business sense, Jack says it's difficult to lose STS's staff members. Two of them, Rita Chalon and Teresa Edwards, have accepted new positions in Human Resources. "I happen to have four people here who really love their work," she says. "But Stanford's business is not temporary employees. Stanford's business is education." SR

## **2.2 Summary of Comments About Stanford Temporary Service (STS)**

Attempts were made to contact staff knowledgeable about STS operations. One of the key individuals, Rita Chalon - program administrator, did not respond to a request for information. However, Linda Jack - former employment manager, Kathy Davis - former HR director, Carol Olsen - HR director, and Teresa Mattox – former payroll administrator provided their perspectives. In addition, Office of Staff Employment personnel who worked closely with STS provided their views.

**HR Director** – STS was established during a period of frustration with regard to hiring administrative associates. Faculty and administrators desired a “pipeline” of people trained in Stanford systems like Kronos, etc. One reason noted for having an internal agency was “consistency” when hiring temporaries. Departments paid overhead. Manpower charged a 28% markup which was considered “high” (19% more appropriate). Stanford’s benefits rate for temporaries was 8%. Key staff included Linda Jack – former employment manager, who was in charge when the agency ended (also negotiated agreement with Manpower) and Rita Chalon – program administrator, who was responsible for placing temporaries including retirees, layoffs, etc.

**Former Employment Manager** – Linda Jack headed the internal temporary agency with a staff of three (supervisor and two placement people). The agency was never “exclusive” or required – departmental participation was voluntary. An insufficient volume of workers in the pool was a periodic problem. In addition, as a Stanford service center the in-house agency was constrained by Stanford's business practices, while the competitors (outside agencies) were not.

Linda Jack recalls, “a service center in those days only had a 5% operating margin, so if we made 10% one year, we could only roll over 5% of that ‘profit.’ Stanford's benefits rate was also much higher than competitors as well. This is not to say that it is impossible for an in-house service to be successful, but as long as it is competing with external agencies, I think it is problematic.” The agency became increasingly difficult to run due to the tightness of the labor market at the time. According to Ms. Jack, departmental use of outside agencies suggested that STS placements were not better.

Successes included better screened applicants, and good relationships with the STS staff. The “value” created was in placing people better capable of meeting Stanford's needs. People who were placed knew Stanford systems. Departments who used the internal agency “were happy.”

With regard to reinstating STS Ms. Jack said that Stanford should “do a very rigorous cost comparison with outside vendors to be sure that an internal service can compete on both price and billing.” She noted that if a reinstated STS is unable to compete on price that there would “need to be something very compelling about the internal service to make users select the higher cost option.”

Ms. Jack adds, “We thought we had that edge in the old service because placement was better and more personal. Also, many temps were trained on Stanford systems. In the end, the users loved the service but still went with the lower cost external vendors. My advice is to not even try if there's not a good business case for being competitive.”

**Former HR Director** – According to Kathy Davis, STS was a long standing service when Linda Jack (former employment manager) got there. It lasted “for years.” Rita Chalon (program administrator) never thought it was a good idea to close because of the value it was providing to the University. Operating STS was a “huge amount of work” involving many constituencies with differing needs. Additional agencies were needed to meet Stanford's requirements (4-5 agencies including Option One, Manpower, etc).

Working conditions were a “non-issue” except for temporary workers who received benefits. While temporaries receiving benefits was a “positive,” departments pushed back because of increased costs. A good idea would be to put people on payroll to be “roving temps.”

An important question about which we need to be clear is, “What is the problem we are trying to solve?”

**Former Payroll Administrator** – Teresa Mattox worked as part of a “team of three” responsible for handling financial matters. STS was “self-sufficient” – the service paid for itself. Most temporary employees worked for a limited time (to preclude engagement of benefits). A few who worked beyond a certain number of hours were granted benefits. Departments were happy with the service, especially the ability to hire people with Stanford knowledge. “Lots of layoffs” were employed.

While many temporary employees were seeking regular employment, “departments tended to hire from the outside” even when a “temp” had been in place for a number of months. These employees felt overlooked.

With regard to quality of life issues STS was a place where “people felt like a family.” Temporary workers were “treated well” and felt “comfortable.” Workers were probably treated better than those working for outside agencies. There was a sense that the STS staff was “concerned” about them.

Like Kathy Davis, Teresa stressed the need to be clear about the purpose of the program.

### **3.0 Temporary Services at Other Universities**

To provide context for deciding the future of temporary services at Stanford, a brief review of what other universities do is provided below. The amount and type of information available about each service varied significantly.

#### **3.1 University of Washington (UW) - UTEMP**

The University of Washington has an internal temporary service called UTEMP. According to Executive Director, Joanne Suffis there are two ways for temporary workers to get on board (see below). They are a mini-agency with high volume requests. Clients are very happy with the round-robin coverage and will request a specific recruiter if services have been excellent or if the recruiter knows the department. UTEMP has a full recruitment staff for a 24 hour turn-around, and short time-to-fill time ratio.

The staff of eleven (11) includes: one (1) HR manager, two (2) fiscal specialists, three (3) staffing coordinators, one (1) staffing supervisor, one (1) recruiter, and three (3) HR assistants including a help desk specialist and an operations manager.

1) Direct Hire Temps - A UW department has found someone for their grant or fixed term project. In this case, UTEMP only “on boards” the person.

2) UTEMP’s Program (Subsidized) - This is a fee based and state funded program, where about 90% of the roles are administrative. In addition UTEMP also fills most

of the housing and food services jobs, black tie catered events, etc. Other agencies are called upon to fill jobs that are harder to fill. UTEMP's talent pool has a combination of people that like the flexible lifestyle and working when they want, as well as those that are successfully making a transition to becoming a regular hire for UW. They filled over 1000 temporary positions during 2005

An online user friendly interface facilitates temporary worker orientation. UTEMP recognizes they service a "have and have not" client base. Their School of Medicine has money, so they may or may not use UTEMP. The English Department does not have as much money, so they are a frequent client. All clients are charged a fee, which has been reduced this year, due to volume and the receipt of state funding.

An overview of the temporary worker orientation may be found in Appendix B, and at <http://www.washington.edu/admin/hr/jobs/temporient/basics.html>.

### **3.2 University of California, Irvine (UCI) – Quick Temp**

The Campus Temporary Employment Service (CTES) is the Human Resources unit of the University of California at Irvine that recruits, interviews and hires qualified candidates for temporary positions at the campus and medical center. CTES also processes the payroll for these employees and then invoices the department where the employee is placed. Invoicing includes salary, benefits costs, and an administrative service fee. CTES has an average payroll of 125 temporary employees and is experiencing a steady increase due to fluctuations with departmental budgets and growing transitional workforce needs.

CTES converted its twenty (20) year-old manual process to a highly automated on-line system that has streamlined the process, reduced errors by seventy-five percent (75%) and saved time. While it evaluated external vendors for the conversion it ultimately decided to "build" a system itself (using on-campus IT resources) to meet its unique needs.

An overview of the project may be found in Appendix B, and at <http://www.ucop.edu/irc/itlc/sautter/ucquicktemp.pdf>

### **3.3 San Francisco State University (SFSU) – Temporary Pool**

SFSU operates an Administrative Support Assistant and Coordinator Office Support Temporary Pool. Information about the Temporary Pool (from the SFSU web site) is below. Information for temporary employees may be found in Appendix B, and at <http://www.sfsu.edu/~hrwww/employee/tempstaf.htm>.

Purpose - To provide hiring departments with office support staffing on an immediate basis for a period not to exceed 180 calendar days.

## Use of the Pool

Hiring departments may request Office Support Pool (Pool) applications for the following reasons:

- To temporarily replace current employees on a 180-day or less leave of absence (medical, maternity, family or other leaves)
- To temporarily hire candidates to assist in workload management, special projects or beginning/end of fiscal year processing
- To cover department emergencies

## Hiring Department Process

The hiring supervisor calls an Human Resources, Safety & Risk Management (HRS&RM) Employment Representative to notify them of the appointment of a possible less-than-180-day hire, reasons for hiring, briefly describe the essential functions to be performed, the duration of the employment period, and the required knowledge, skills and abilities.

The Employment Representative will determine the appropriate classification and salary rate. The starting salary is usually the minimum rate of the classification for which the Pool candidate is being recommended.

The hiring supervisor may take up to ten (10) applications/resumes for a maximum of five (5) days. The balance of the applications must remain in Human Resources so other hiring supervisors may also use the Pool resources.

The hiring supervisor makes direct contact with applicants to arrange an interview - either by telephone or face to face. Upon completion of the interviews, all Pool applications previously taken by the hiring supervisor (including the successful candidate's) must be hand-carried and returned to Human Resources, Safety & Risk Management within five (5) days. The reference check process must take place prior to the candidate's starting employment.

## **4.0 Considerations for Creating an In-House Temporary Service**

The Society for Human Resources Management (SHRM) published a "white paper" in 2001 that detailed the numerous considerations involved in deciding to establish an in-house temporary service.

The premise for the paper was that "companies can compete with staffing firms for the temporary talent pool and at the same time reduce staffing costs. This is possible by saving the markup that staffing firms charge and by focusing on hiring highly qualified candidates with the needed skill sets. This can be done because in-house temporary employees can be paid more in compensation and benefits than competing staffing firms offer them."

The entire document may be found in Appendix A – Society for Human Resources Management (SHRM) White Paper. Selected sections are below.

**SHRM White Paper - *CREATING NEW TEMPORARY HIRE OPTIONS THROUGH IN-HOUSE AGENCIES* excerpts:**

“Developing and maintaining an in-house staffing pool takes some work and planning. Internal resources need to be dedicated to the project. The HR staff needs to be knowledgeable in how to recruit, interview and hire qualified staff. Computer software and a competitive compensation and benefits package are needed to attract and keep competent temporaries interested...”

**How is an In-house Temporary Agency Different?**

“Traditionally, a company that needs help building a staff of temporary workers enlists the aid of a vendor that specializes in temporary employment. The client company looks to the vendor to source, identify and recruit potential temporary employees and to pay them from the vendor's payroll. An advantage of this type of arrangement is that the company is relieved of the time and effort of recruiting such candidates... Once temporary employees begin work at the client company, any issues related to pay or performance becomes the responsibility of the vendor to resolve. In many cases, the vendor presents the company's code of conduct or basic policies regarding employment so the temporary workers know what the rules are...”

**Why Would a Company Adopt an "In-house" Agency?**

“Why would a company entertain the work and exposure of hiring its own temporary workers? Cost is a big part of the consideration... Employers who pay outside temporary vendors are paying on two levels: the salary of the worker and the cost of providing the service... Generally, the markup rate charged by temporary agencies averages between 30-40 percent...”

Other advantages include greater flexibility in scheduling, ease in supervision, lower administrative costs and better quality of performance. The in-house temporary pool may be a way to employ employees who have been downsized or are in some kind of career transition. Temporary workers in many instances may transition to fulltime employment. About 55 percent of all temporary employees use temporary work as a bridge to permanent employment. The practice of auditioning permanent employee candidates as temporary employees first is the fastest growing segment of the staffing industry, reflecting the desires by employers to observe candidates for a trial period before deciding whether they are the right fit for the job...”

**What Resources are Needed to Operate a Temporary In-house Agency?**

“First, a person dedicated to making the program a success is needed to champion the cause. Ideally, the person should be dedicated to the establishment and

maintenance of the agency on a fulltime basis... Qualified individuals include those with concentrated staffing experience, perhaps people who have formerly worked for a temporary vendor agency... It is suggested that there be some kind of at-risk compensation paid to the person heading up the agency based on the number of placements made as a way to direct the behavior of the in-house administrator...

Additionally the in-house administrator will need software to develop a database of applicants and jobs with the capacity to sort and make a match... A balance sheet approach is suggested to estimate and track in house temporary expenses..."

### **What Are Compensation and Benefits Issues Affecting Temporaries?**

"A review of benefits received by the permanent staff of the company is needed in terms of their impact on the in-house temporary staff. Any benefit that is a product of hours worked will carry the most sensitivity, such as pension. A careful tracking of hours worked is needed to ensure that the in-house pool does not qualify for benefits if they were not projected as part of the cost savings. Hourly pay of the temporary staff may need to be more than the regular staff since temporaries may not qualify for insurance benefits. Management needs to be prepared to answer questions that will arise about the differences in rates. "

### **Employee Relations Concerns**

"If you are going to use an in-house agency, be sure that it is a first class operation; otherwise, there is a risk of developing negative feedback on the part of regular employees. Most regular employees understand the need for businesses to use temporary staff where there is a temporary need. They are only looking for assurance that their job will not be made harder by incompetent temps or that their job security will not be affected."

### **Make Sure Policies for Temps and Perms Make Sense and Are Legally Defensible**

"In-house temporary employees are generally protected by the same civil rights laws, worksite safety requirements, minimum wage and overtime provisions, laws relating to collective bargaining, workers' compensation, unemployment insurance and myriad other labor and employment laws... Also, temporary workers with a sufficient "community of interest" can be included in the worksite employer's collective bargaining unit (Contingent and Alternative Employment Arrangements, February 1999, *U.S. Department of Labor News*)."

#### **4.1 Manpower's On-Site Program at Stanford**

Manpower says that it "has been servicing Stanford University for more than 25 years." It succeeded the Stanford Temporary Service (STS) and operated until 2003. Manpower says its annual billing for that year was 4.3 million dollars. Their on-site staff included as many as three people. A news article about the transition from STS to Manpower follows.

***Stanford News Service - April 15, 1998 (Manpower Selected to Provide Onsite Service)***

### **Manpower agency to run campus temporary job service**

Manpower Staffing Services has been chosen to run Stanford's onsite temporary job service, replacing the university's in-house system that served campus for seven years.

Manpower, the world's largest employment service, is expected to start operating on campus at 655 Serra St. on April 20. The onsite manager will be Catherine Bass, says Linda Jack, employment manager in Human Resources. On April 20, the main telephone number will be 725-7882. Until then, supervisors who need assistance can contact Susan Lee Young at Manpower's Palo Alto office on University Avenue at 323-2200.

Manpower was selected from a pool of 17 firms that submitted bids because it could provide what Jack calls "Stanford-ready" temporary employees who are familiar with university operations. For a fee, Manpower will offer services not currently available on campus, such as applicant background and reference checking. Jack says Manpower also will be able to offer more detailed information about the use of temporary staff at Stanford.

Typically, a temporary employee is considered to be someone working for less than six months or less than 50 percent time.

Stanford Temporary Service (STS), the university's homegrown operation, was initially set up when temp agencies offered fewer services and often could not meet the needs of departments, Jack says. But, in recent years, campus supervisors turned to commercial firms for help in filling positions in an increasingly tight labor market. Jack says that STS, a not-for-profit venture, found it difficult to compete as commercial agencies became more sophisticated and aggressive in finding and training workers. STS stopped making new job placements in January after it was announced that an outside vendor would be selected.

Jack says that Manpower plans to offer job fairs on campus, advertise Stanford positions through its own website and via outlets such as newspapers, provide skills-testing of temporary hires, create an orientation guide for Stanford temps and work with hiring supervisors and Human Resource officers to determine departmental staffing needs. It will also carry out long-distance interviews using a video-

conferencing system that allows the interviewer on campus and an applicant, based in a Manpower office, to see and talk to each other via a split screen.

Although Manpower will be the only campus-based agency, Jack says, that supervisors may continue to use seven other approved companies: Norrell Services Inc., Kelly Temporary Services, Option 1 Temporary Services, Olsten Staffing Services, Interim Personnel, Adecco and Contract Services Co. SR.

## 5.0 Numerical Data – Stanford’s Casual and Temporary Workforce

The table below shows that during the calendar year 2005 Stanford had almost 4,700 casual<sup>1</sup> and temporary<sup>2</sup> workers (excluding faculty, academic staff, professional/technical, bargaining unit, on-call, and SLAC). On average, they worked thirty-four (34) days or a little under seven (7) weeks (at 40 hours per week).

### DEFINITIONS

**1 - CASUAL EMPLOYEES** — Employees appointed less than half-time for six consecutive months or longer. If duties are technical, maintenance, or service duties, employees may be appointed less than half (1/2) time for four (4) consecutive months or longer. Casual employees are not regular employees.

**2 - TEMPORARY EMPLOYEES** — Employees appointed for up to six (6) consecutive months at any percentage of time. If duties are technical, maintenance, or service duties, employees may be appointed for up to four (4) consecutive months at any percentage of time. Temporary employees are not regular employees.

Table 1

### Casual<sup>1</sup> and Temporary<sup>2</sup> Workforce\* – Calendar Year 2005

Category	Casual	Temporary	Total	Avg. Hours
Exempt	73	116	189	310.4
Non-Exempt	1587	2907	4494	270.9
<b>Total</b>	<b>1660</b>	<b>3023</b>	<b>4683</b>	<b>272.5</b>

\* – Does not include faculty, academic staff, professional/technical, bargaining unit, on-call, or SLAC.

## 6.0 Pre-Bids for Stanford On-Site Program 2006 (external vendors)

During December of 2005 temporary services firms were advised of Stanford's intent to review the possibility of reinstating its internal temporary service. In that context, they were asked to provide preliminary information (pre-bid) with regard to how they would provide a similar service. This data was used to assess the cost effectiveness of Stanford providing temporary staffing services for itself as opposed to an external vendor.

The table below reflects the mark-up rates (percentage of employee salary charged) vendors provided during the pre-bid process for temporary workers they recruit and place at Stanford. The major cost to the University of a vendor's program is obtained when these rates are multiplied by the total dollar amount of employee salaries for any given period. The effect of these rates on costs is examined in section 7.0, "Model – Stanford Temporary Service 2 (STS2) – Cost Comparisons" on page 23.

Table 2

Vendor Mark-Up Rates* for Stanford On-Site Temporary Program				
Vendor	West Valley	Manpower	Option 1	Spherion
Rate	32%	33%	34%	35%

\* Highest preliminary bid rates for vendor recruited workers placed at Stanford (subject to negotiation).

Additional information from firms responding may be found in the pre-bid proposal excerpts below and in Appendix C.

### 6.1 West Valley Staffing Group (WVSG) – Pre-Bid Proposal excerpts

"The following is a listing of some of the services we can provide Stanford University:

- Full-service recruiting capability through four specialty companies
- Recruiting services for all temporary and direct personnel
- On-site staff to manage the entire contingent workforce
- Management of all subcontracted vendors
- Consolidated invoicing of all subcontracted vendors
- 1099 audit, compliance and defense
- Customized payroll service program
- Customized training on Stanford University systems including but not limited to Oracle, PeopleSoft, Kronos and Microsoft Office
- Customized testing and screening programs for basic and advanced skills. WVSG has the ability to test on over 350 different disciplines including Administrative, Accounting, Legal and Technical skills

- WVSG’s proprietary web-based technology to manage the process of securing temporary personnel
- Risk abatement consulting including but not limited to safety training, sexual harassment seminars, protection of intellectual property ...etc.
- Criminal background checks
- Department of Defense facility clearance to the Secret level
- WVSG temporary employee benefits program”

“For the purposes of your analysis, WVSG provides the following **pricing estimates** based on our current knowledge of your program:

- Mark up for “payroll service” temporary employees = 19-22%
- Mark up for “recruited” temporary employees = 29-32%
- Conversion schedule for “payroll service” temporary employees = No fee conversion at anytime
- Conversion schedule for “recruited” temporary employees = No fee after 3 months
- Monthly charge for on-site staff = No fee
- Weekly consolidated invoicing program = No fee
- Customized skill testing of candidates = No fee
- 1099 audit for compliance = No fee
- Customized training on software packages = To be determined depending on the volume of candidates that require training
- Fee for direct placements = 12-15% “

## **6.2 Manpower Staffing Services (Manpower) – Pre-Bid Proposal excerpts**

“Manpower has been servicing Stanford University for more than 25 years. Our organization has major **service advantages**:

- Account Management Leadership – No additional cost to Stanford
- Recruiting Team – No additional cost to Stanford
- Onsite Management Team – No additional cost to Stanford
- Administration of subcontracts – No additional cost to Stanford
- Technology Tool – No additional cost to Stanford
- Training – No additional cost to Stanford
- Benefits – No additional cost to Stanford
- Job Board Advertising – No additional cost to Stanford”

“We are offering Stanford our current **rate of 33%** without any additional costs. Our **mark-up includes the following**:

- Workers’ compensation
- Unemployment insurance

- Social security
- Federal, state and local taxes
- All related payroll costs
- Account management leadership
- Recruiting team
- On-site management team
- Administration of subcontracts
- Technology tool
- Training
- Benefits
- Job board advertising”

### **6.3 Kelly Services (KS) – Pre-Bid Proposal excerpts**

Kelly Services did not respond succinctly to the specific request for information contained in the inquiry sent to all vendors. Kelly Services also declined to provide specific pricing information. Excerpts of what they provided are below.

“A program designed and managed by Kelly Services will provide the greatest cost savings, and standardization, as well as produce maximum compliance. Below is an outline of program recommendations:

- On-site staffing model based on Stanford’s goals and vision
- A comprehensive implementation including mapping and analysis of Stanford’s contingent workforce as a springboard to business process re-engineering and assimilation
- An unparalleled service plan that balances critical business functions, accountability and seamless transition
- Centralized data collection and analysis backed by decisive action plans to meet changes and challenges in the marketplace
- Consolidated invoicing through EDI/EFT or other methods
- Manage and report on the number of temporary workers by department, skill, hours worked, etc.
- Customized testing, training, on-boarding and off-boarding”

### **6.4 Option 1 – Pre-Bid Proposal excerpts**

“Throughout our 14-year working relationship with Stanford University, we have customized **our services** to meet the unique needs of Stanford’s departments. Some of the specialized services we offer are: Weekly recruiter visits to departments, large project procedural training and orientation off site, on site luncheons for many departments with numerous Associates working there, parking passes, Annual Associate Appreciation Luncheon with all Stanford contacts invited as well. Senior Management visits, Associate of the Month, National Temporary Help Week recognition.

- Applicant Screen Process – “The best of the best”
- Interviewing Process
- Skill Assessment/Testing
- Screening and Background Checks
- Employee Orientation
- Benefits
- Customized reports
- Invoicing
- Insurance”

## **PRICING INFORMATION**

### **Payroll Services**

“From 1992 – 1998 Option 1 Staffing Services was the exclusive payroll service provider to Stanford University. We are very experienced with the payroll service procedures at Stanford and welcome an opportunity to assist you again. The mark up for clerical payroll services is 25.5%.”

### **Conversion**

“If an Option 1 Staffing Services Associate is to convert to direct employee status with Stanford University after ninety calendar days of temporary employment then no conversion fee shall apply. If an Associate is to convert to a direct status prior to ninety calendar days then a conversion fee shall be due. The determination of the conversion fee is a structured discount applied to the direct placement fee (20% of the annual salary). The discount is 0-30 days no discount, 31-60 days 25% discount, 60-90 days 50% discount. The conversion fee is not applicable to payrolled employees.”

### **Rate**

“Option 1 Staffing Services has been contributing to the success of Stanford University for over fourteen (14) years. We would be honored to continue that relationship and offer a 34% mark-up for all our Clerical and Administrative positions.”

## **6.5 Spherion – Pre-Bid Proposal excerpts**

### **Dedicated On-Site Management**

“Our customizable solution will be delivered through on-site presence at Stanford. The Spherion on-site team will be accountable and responsible for:

- 1) Developing a collaborative relationship and maintaining proactive involvement with Stanford to ensure maximum business development, total client satisfaction and employee retention
- 2) Developing and implementing an effective recruiting strategy to ensure the availability of qualified flexible/full-time employees in order to meet current and anticipated needs:
  - Including Spherion proprietary prescreening and assessment best practices to include behavioral interviews, hard and soft skills assessments
  - Spherion can work with Stanford to coordinate training sessions unique to the job functions at your location
  - Spherion’s cutting-edge technology featuring password protected Web portals, available 24/7, to initiate job order requests and reports for clients, customized job searches for candidates as well as on-line time-keeping for streamlined payroll processing and real-time invoice/reporting information
- 3) Designing customized orientation for new hires
- 4) Communicating and coordinating the various aspects of operations to ensure compliance with established policies and procedures as well as local, state and federal laws and guidelines (Worker’s Compensation, Unemployment, HR, Legal, WOTC, Account Management System, etc.)
- 5) Coordinating the selection and management of affiliate vendors to ensure compliance with service level agreements”

**PRICING**

**Managing Vendor Service Options**

“As primary and managing vendor, Spherion is pleased to offer:

Temporary Associate Pricing	35% mark-up (clerical/admin)
Temporary to Regular Conversion	fees waived for Stanford
Direct Hire Fee	20% of annual salary
Payroll Service	28% mark-up (clerical/admin)
Additional Benefits Required	to be determined
Costs Associated with On-Site Location	to be determined”

## 7.0 Model – Stanford Temporary Service 2 (STS2)

To provide a cost and benefit analysis a model was created to reflect an internal temporary service that would be similar to the original Stanford Temporary Service (STS) established in 1990. This model is called, “Stanford Temporary Service 2” or “STS2.” To better understand the value of STS2, it is compared to external vendors, specifically in regard to costs.

### Components

STS2 has been modeled after STS. However, because of changes at Stanford that have occurred since STS discontinued operations some differences exist. For example, when STS was in operation Stanford was using “legacy” electronic and paper based systems that required less worker training. The introduction of PeopleSoft, Oracle, and Kronos has resulted in a need for additional training resources to be included in the STS2 model.

In addition, campus space limitations make it likely that STS2 would have to operate from an off-campus location. This would incur additional costs. Further, the suggestion that a small number of temporary workers be classified as “floaters” (i.e., “continuing temps”) requires the addition of resources to cover the cost of full benefits.

The table below reflects the components and annual projected costs associated with operating a University sponsored in-house temporary employee service.

**Table 3**

<b>Components and Annual Costs – Stanford Temporary Service 2 Model</b>	
<b>Component</b>	<b>Costs</b>
Regular Staff Salaries (with benefits) → Manager (1) → Placement Specialists (2) → Trainer/Tester (1)	\$ 430,000
Temporary Worker Benefit Charges → 90 employees <sup>1</sup> @ 8% - no health benefits → 10 employees <sup>2</sup> (floaters) @ 30% - full benefits	\$ 419,248
Other Administrative → Office space → Marketing/Advertising → Training software → Supplies	\$ 273,000
<b>TOTAL COST</b>	<b>\$ 1,122,248</b>

<sup>1</sup> - Full time, 11 mos. at \$21 per hour (avg.).

<sup>2</sup> - Full time 12 mos. at \$21 per hour (avg.).

## Cost Comparisons

The cost to operate the STS2 model (see Table 3) was compared to what external providers would charge for a similar service (recruit and place temporary workers on campus). Specifically, Stanford costs to administer the service were compared to vendor charges as reflected in mark-up rates. This comparison helps to understand the cost of the service regardless of who provides it.

The table below shows that the University can operate this service at a slightly lower cost than vendors. Specifically, as a percentage of salaries paid to temporary employees (shown in Table 4 as “Mark-Up”) Stanford’s rate to administer the service is the lowest at twenty-eight (28) percent. This rate applied to approximately \$4M in projected annual salary expenditures should result in cost savings to the University that exceed \$150K. By operating the service itself Stanford should see savings that approximate twelve (12) percent of what the lowest cost vendor (West Valley) would charge.

**Table 4**

<b>Annual Costs and Mark-Up Rates to Operate Temporary Service<sup>1</sup></b>					
<b>Operator</b>	Stanford <sup>2</sup>	West Valley	Manpower	Option 1	Spherion
<b>Cost (thousands)</b>	\$1,122	\$1,281	\$1,321	\$1,361	\$1,401
<b>Mark-Up<sup>3</sup></b>	28%	32%	33%	34%	35%

<sup>1</sup> - Assumes \$21 per hour (avg.) for 100 employees (90 for 11 mos.; 10 for 12 mos.) <sup>2</sup> - In the case of Stanford, the mark-up is actually the administrative cost to the University to run the program. Vendor costs/mark-ups do not include “floater” benefit expenses. <sup>3</sup> - Mark-ups subject to negotiation.

While the preceding cost information reflects favorably on the idea of implementing STS2, it should be kept in mind that the vendor data shown reflects rates that may be negotiated downward during a formal bid, or request for proposal process.

## Other Factors

The quality of vendor applicant referrals and worker preparation for Stanford (training, orientation, etc.) cannot be easily assessed, nor can we predict that Stanford’s ability in these areas will be superior. In fact, the experience of Stanford’s original temporary service (STS) shows that it did not stand out as being clearly superior to external vendors.

In light of the forgoing, it’s likely that departments hiring temporary workers may find the small cost savings (perhaps \$200 - \$300 on a typical assignment) to be inconsequential in their selection of a temporary service provider.

## 7.1 Considerations – What Problem Are We Trying To Solve?

Those who provided information about the original Stanford Temporary Service indicated that while successful, it served a variety of purposes and that its charge was not especially clear. To paraphrase two of those individuals an appropriate question to ask is “what problem are we trying solve?”

The Presidential Committee recommended that the University consider *“reinstating its temporary employment agency where among the benefits should be counted the superior ability to monitor labor standards and conditions of workers who are employees of Stanford University.”* Clearly, the emphasis of the recommendation (as written) was to look at how internal temporary hiring could provide a superior ability to monitor the treatment of workers.

This was not stated as a significant requirement or concern of the original internal temporary service (STS). In addition, the scope of STS – relatively small (about 100 workers at any one time) and its primary focus on office workers made it incapable of monitoring labor standards and conditions for all temporary and casual workers. Reinstating STS (implementing STS2) would not alter this ability.

### Worker Satisfaction

The recommendation from the Presidential Committee implies that temporary and casual workers may not be satisfied with their work. Data from the Presidential Committee report on this topic suggests that the majority of temporary workers are very satisfied with their work at the University. Specifically, sixty-two percent (62%) of surveyed temporary and casual workers indicated that they were “very satisfied” with their work at Stanford. This compares favorably to twenty-five percent (25%) of regular employees, as shown in the table below.

**Table 5**

<b>Survey of Temporary and Casual Workers*</b>		
<b>How satisfied are you with your current work at Stanford?</b>	<b>Temp. &amp; Casual Employees n=311</b>	<b>Regular Employees n=24</b>
Very satisfied	62.0%	25%
Somewhat satisfied	29.6%	27.5%
Somewhat dissatisfied	5.5%	29.5%
Very dissatisfied	2.9%	8.3%

\* Presidential Committee on Workplace Policies and Practices Report, June 11, 2004, Appendix A, page 79 (not included in this report).

## Worker Treatment

The recommendation from the Presidential Committee report also implies that temporary workers may be not receiving appropriate treatment. While not exhaustive, the list of possible worker concerns below compares temporary and casual employees with regular employees. In categories other than “hourly pay” and “the commute” temporary and casual employee ratings were similar or more favorable in comparison to the ratings of regular employees.

Specifically, with regard to worker treatment issues like “*how hard you have to work*,” “*opportunity to voice concerns*” and “*getting along with supervisor*” – temporary and casual employees expressed considerably less concern than regular employees as shown in the table below.

**Table 6**

<b>Survey of Temporary and Casual Workers*</b>		
<b>Choose the aspects of your Stanford employment that concern you.</b>	<b>Temp. &amp; Casual Employees n=311</b>	<b>Regular Employees n=25</b>
The hourly pay	45.3%	56.0%
Losing your job	22.2%	20.0%
The commute	16.4%	4.0%
Problems with child care	2.6%	4.0%
How hard you have to work	7.7%	24.0%
The need to have a second job	14.5%	28.0%
No opportunity to voice concerns	8.7%	32.0%
Getting along with your supervisor	6.4%	14.0%
Getting along with co-workers	5.1%	4.0%
Other	18.0%	16.0%

\* Presidential Committee on Workplace Policies and Practices Report, June 11, 2004, Appendix A, page 79 (not included in this report).

## Labor Standards and Conditions

Most of the data above indicates that appropriate treatment of temporary and casual workers (labor standards and conditions) may not be a cogent issue. However, if we assume that it is, an important question to ask is, “How can we best monitor labor standards and conditions of temporary workers?”.

It’s easy to assume that a University operated enterprise would be more interested than an external vendor in doing a good job of providing oversight of labor standards and conditions. However, the preceding data suggesting that temporary workers may be more satisfied with their work than regular employees belies that notion.

In fact, worker treatment (labor standards and conditions) is more related to the immediate job site and quality of supervision than it is to the source of employee (internal or external temporary service) or overall employing organization. Whether or not we accept this as true, if we were to “monitor labor standards and conditions” how would we do it?

## **7.2 Alternatives to Stanford Temporary Service 2 (STS2)**

If our main purpose is to address worker treatment, we may want to consider ways that may better address the issue than reinstating STS2.

**Monitor** – Contractual obligations may be placed upon any vendor to monitor the treatment of workers (labor standards and conditions). Such obligations may include periodic and unscheduled visits to individual job sites to verify satisfactory worker treatment.

**Sanctions for Contract Violations** – Vendors may be required to compensate the University and/or the temporary and casual worker(s) for failure to provide satisfactory treatment (labor standards and conditions).

**Survey** – A periodic survey may be taken of temporary and casual workers to determine worker perceptions regarding treatment. Survey data may be used to guide corrective actions and/or improve future conditions.

**Hotline** – Workers may be provided a telephone number and/or email address to immediately report any occurrences of worker mistreatment. A University office may be designated to address concerns raised.

## **8.0 Summary of Findings**

### **Assessment of the Original Stanford Temporary Service (STS)**

News reports and interviews show that the Stanford Temporary Service (STS) that operated during the nineties was financially successful and that clients were satisfied. However, interview information suggests that the purpose for the “internal agency” was unclear, and that over time STS found it increasingly difficult to compete with external vendors. It appears that when operations were discontinued STS was viewed by potential Stanford clients as “just another option” as opposed to a “high value added” service.

There is no evidence to suggest that STS was designed to address worker treatment issues, nor was information found that indicated that STS ever assumed this role.

### **Costs of Reinstating Stanford Temporary Service (STS2 Model)**

Reinstating the Stanford Temporary Service (STS) today would require additional components and resources when compared to the original model. These have been incorporated into the model called Stanford Temporary Service 2 (STS2). Still, at an estimated annual cost to the University of \$1,122,248, STS2 might provide savings approximating \$150,000 per year, when comparing Stanford’s cost to the lowest price vendor charge.

Considered in aggregate, the savings to the University appear to be significant. However, the estimated savings should be viewed in a broader context that recognizes that 1) vendors may lower their pre-bid price rate quotes in a formal bidding process - thereby reducing what Stanford could save, and 2) factors outside of cost (i.e., referred worker qualifications) may play a substantial role in service selection at the local level.

### **Benefits of Reinstating Stanford Temporary Service (STS2 Model)**

Benefits related to the cost of operating STS2 should include the elimination of charges to local units for payroll service, conversion fees, and direct placements. However, these savings may be somewhat offset by STS2 administrative fees.

Benefits unrelated to the cost of operating STS2 should include the ability to better match candidates to openings, and the ability to provide training specific to Stanford systems (PeopleSoft, Oracle, and Kronos). However, because these benefits (abilities) are highly subjective in nature, the specific individuals hired to operate STS2 will determine whether these benefits can be realized.

## **Intent of Committee Recommendation - Worker Treatment Issues**

While the intent of recommendation number five (5) appears to be to assure “the superior ability to monitor labor standards and conditions of workers who are employees of Stanford University” it’s clear that this may not be adequately accomplished by “reinstating its temporary employment agency” as originally designed. STS was never intended to fulfill this responsibility (nor did it).

The updated service model STS2 may also be inadequate to address worker treatment issues because solutions to perceived problems can only be investigated and resolved at individual job sites within local units. While components may be added to STS2 to attempt to address worker treatment issues, these issues may be addressed without STS2 implementation.

## **Alternatives to Stanford Temporary Service 2 (STS2)**

Perceived worker treatment problems can only be investigated and resolved at individual job sites within local units. As noted, these can be implemented without “reinstating Stanford’s temporary agency.” Alternatives to implementing STS2 include:

- 1) requiring temporary worker providers to monitor job sites through periodic and unscheduled visits,
- 2) sanctioning providers when conditions are found to be unacceptable,
- 3) surveying workers regularly, and
- 4) providing a worker “hotline” to report issues.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many thanks to all who provided assistance in the preparation of this report including:

Mario Acquesta  
Rosemary Bracy  
Tom Castillo  
Anita Craig  
Kathy Davis  
Ellen Encarnacio

Noel Hirst  
Carmen Jacinto  
Linda Jack  
Kathy Mahler  
Teresa Mattox  
Carol Olsen

Diane Peck  
Cristen Shinbashi  
Marie Toney  
Monica Valerio  
Agnes Veith

*Keith Copeland*  
Human Resources Services

January 17, 2006

## **APPENDICES**

**APPENDIX A** – Society for Human Resources Management (SHRM) White Paper – Creating New Temporary Hire Options Through In-House Agencies

**APPENDIX B** – Temporary Services at Other Universities

**APPENDIX C** - External Temporary Agency Pre-Bids to Provide On-Site Services to Stanford University

## **APPENDIX A**

Society for Human Resources Management (SHRM) White Paper –  
Creating New Temporary Hire Options Through In-House Agencies

## **APPENDIX B**

### Temporary Services at Other Universities –

University of Washington (UW)

University of California at Irvine (UCI)

San Francisco State University (SFSU)

## **APPENDIX C**

### **External Temporary Agency Pre-Bids to Provide On-Site Services to Stanford University**

West Valley Staffing Group

Manpower Staffing Services

Option 1 Staffing Services

Kelly Services

Spherion

**(Delete)**

